

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 8 and 16 have been objected to for informalities. Claim 8 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1. Claim 8 and 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Claims 1, 4, 9, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,831,849 (Matsui). Claims 2 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of US Patent 6,930,795 (Motamed). Claims 3 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of Motamed, and in further view of US Patent 4,860,005 (Deluca). Claims 5 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of official notice. Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 19, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of US Patent 5,922,075 (Bowker). Claim 8, and 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui in view of US Patent Publication 2004/0025071 (Vicard). Claims 8 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claims 8 and 16 are objected to for informalities. Applicant has corrected the informalities. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 8 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 for failing to meet the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that the specification does not describe how the computing device can be in an ACPI S0 state defined as fully on when the power consumption of the system components are reduced to a low power state. Applicant respectfully submits that this feature is fully described and enabled to one of ordinary skill in the art at ¶ 61 for example. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 8 and 16.

Claims 8 and 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 for being indefinite. Specifically the Examiner states that Applicant did not disclose the version associated with the ACPI. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are meant to apply

to all versions of ACPI and are not limited to version 2.0, as suggested by the Examiner. The claims are not indefinite merely because they could be read to cover multiple versions of ACPI. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 8, and 16-20.

35 U.S.C. § 102/103 Rejections

Claims 1-8 contain features neither taught or suggested by the prior art of record. As illustrated by independent claim 1:

A method of providing a simulated off condition in a computing device, said method comprising:

receiving a signal to power off the computing device;

notifying system components of a low power request;

and

reducing power consumption of said system components to a low power state such that said computing device appears to be off, wherein said system components remain enabled to run applications when the computing device is in the simulated off condition.

None of the prior art of record teach **reducing power consumption of said system components to a low power state such that said computing device appears to be off, wherein said system components remain enabled to run applications when the computing device is in the simulated off condition**, as required by independent claim 1.

The Examiner stated that this feature is taught by Matsui. Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, Matsui fails to teach **reducing power consumption of said system components to a low power state**. The cited portion of Matsui teaches entering a standby mode where components other than the control signal receiver are turned completely off. Thus, while some of the components are turned off to save power, none of the components are placed in a low power state as required by claim 1. Turning a component off is not the same as being in a low power state.

Second, Matsui fails to teach **said system components remain enabled to run applications when the computing device is in the simulated off condition**. As taught in the cited reference, many of the components are completely powered down, thus there is simply

no way that they could remain enabled to run applications. Matsui does teach powering up the system components to execute an application, but the components are no longer in the low power state when they begin executing applications.

Similarly, neither Motamed, Deluca, Bowker, nor Vicard teach **reducing power consumption of said system components to a low power state such that said computing device appears to be off, wherein said system components remain enabled to run applications when the computing device is in the simulated off condition**, as required by claim 1.

Because none of the prior art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the feature described above, the combination of these references cannot possibly render independent claim 1 obvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-8 are dependent on independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 2-8.

Claims 9-16 contain features neither taught or suggested by the prior art of record. As illustrated by independent claim 9:

A computing device having a simulated off state,
comprising:

a central processing unit;
a graphics processing unit;
a hard disk drive;
random access memory; and
a power supply,

wherein when said computing device is powered down, the computing device is placed into the simulated off state by placing the system components into a low power state such that the computing device appears to be off, and

wherein the computing device remains enabled to run applications when in the simulated off state.

None of the prior art of record teach **when said computing device is powered down, the computing device is placed into the simulated off state by placing the system components into a low power state such that the computing device appears to be off, and the computing device remains enabled to run applications when in the simulated off state**, as required by independent claim 9. The Examiner stated that this feature is taught in Matsui. Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, Matsui fails to teach **powering down the device into a low power state**. The cited portion of Matsui teaches entering a standby mode where components other than the control signal receiver are turned completely off. Thus, while some of the components are turned off to save power, none of the components are placed in a low power state as required by claim 9. Turning a component off is not the same as being in a low power state.

Second, Matsui fails to teach **the computing device remains enabled to run applications when in the simulated off state**. As taught in the cited reference, many of the components are completely powered down, thus there is simply no way that they could remain enabled to run applications. Matsui does teach powering up the system components to execute an application, but the components are no longer in the low power state when they begin executing applications.

Because none of the prior art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the feature described above, the combination of these references cannot possibly render independent claim 9 obvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 9.

Dependent claims 10-16 are dependent on independent claim 9, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 9. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 10-16.

Claims 17-20 contain features neither taught or suggested by the prior art of record. As illustrated by independent claim 17:

A method of producing a simulated off condition in a computing device when the computing device is in an ACPI S0 state, the method comprising:

receiving a signal to power off the computing device;
notifying system components of a low power request;
and

reducing power consumption of said system components via software using ACPI methods to a low power state such that said computing device appears to be off, wherein said system components remain enabled to run applications when the computing device is in the simulated off condition.

None of the prior art of record teach **reducing power consumption of said system components via software using ACPI methods to a low power state such that said computing device appears to be off, wherein said system components remain enabled to run applications when the computing device is in the simulated off condition**, as required by independent claim 17. The Examiner stated that this feature is taught by Matsui. Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, Matsui fails to teach **reducing power consumption of said system components to a low power state using ACPI methods**. The cited portion of Matsui teaches entering a standby mode where components other than the control signal receiver are turned completely off. Thus, while some of the components are turned off to save power, none of the components are placed in a low power state as required by claim 17. Turning a component off is not the same as being in a low power state.

Second, Matsui fails to teach **said system components remain enabled to run applications when the computing device is in the simulated off condition**. As taught in the cited reference, many of the components are completely powered down, thus there is simply no way that they could remain enabled to run applications. Matsui does teach powering up the system components to execute an application, but the components are no longer in the low power state when they begin executing applications.

Because none of the prior art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the feature described above, the combination of these references cannot possibly render independent claim 17 obvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 17.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2903/306035.01
Application No.: 10/780,039
Office Action Dated: August 11, 2006

PATENT

Dependent claims 18-20 are dependent on independent claim 17, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 17. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 18-20.

Date: November 10, 2006

/Michael W. Tieff/
Michael W. Tieff
Registration No. 57,845

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439